

HITETEK MELLÉ TUDOMÁNYT



Károli Könyvek
tanulmánykötet

Sorozatszerkesztő: Dr. Sepsi Enikő

A szerkesztőbizottság tagjai:

Prof. dr. Balla Péter, dr. Bozsonyi Károly, dr. Csanády Márton, Prof. dr. Fabiny
Tibor, dr. Homicskó Árpád, dr. Kendeffy Gábor, dr. Sepsi Enikő, dr. Szenczi
Árpád, dr. Törő Csaba, Prof. dr. Zsengellér József

HITETEK MELLÉ TUDOMÁNYT



KONFERENCIAKÖTET

DOKTORANDUSZOK ORSZÁGOS SZÖVETSÉGE HITTUDOMÁNYI OSZTÁLY
FIATAL KUTATÓK ÉS DOKTORANDUSZOK
V. NEMZETKÖZI TEOLÓGUSKONFERENCIÁJA
BUDAPEST, 2014. OKTÓBER 24-26.

SZERKESZTETTE
ZILA GÁBOR

Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem • L'Harmattan Kiadó
Budapest, 2014

Hálás szívvel köszönjük mindazok segítségét, akik nagylelkű anyagi támogatásukkal lehetővé tették a konferencia megszervezését és e kötet megjelenését.

Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Hittudományi Kar
Károli Gáspár Egyetem Doktorandusz Önkormányzat
Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége
Zila Kávéház Krisztina Cukrászda és Étterem
Nemzeti Kulturális Alap

A pályázat az Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma megbízásából az Oktatókutatató és Fejlesztő Intézet és az Emberi Erőforrások Támogatáskezelő által meghirdetett NTP-FTK-M-14-0002 kódszámú pályázati támogatásból valósult meg.



Felelős kiadó: Prof. dr. Zsengellér József, a KRE HTK dékánja
Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem
1091 Budapest, Kálvin tér 9.
Telefon: +36 1 455-9060
Fax: +361 455-9062

© Szerzők, szerkesztők, 2014
© Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem, 2014
© L'Harmattan Kiadó, 2014

ISBN 978-963-414-046-7
ISSN 2062-9850

A kiadó kötetei megrendelhetők,
illetve kedvezménnyel megvásárolhatók:
L'Harmattan Könyvesbolt
1053 Budapest, Kossuth L. u. 14–16.
Tel.: (+36-1) 267-5979
harmattan@harmattan.hu
www.harmattan.hu

Párbeszéd Könyvesbolt
1085 Budapest, Horánszky u. 20.
Tel.: (+36-1) 445-2775
www.konyveslap.hu

Olvasószerkesztői és lektori munkák: Zila Gábor
A borítót Kára László készítette.
A borítón a II. Péter 1. rész versei láthatók az 1590-es visolyi Biblia reprint kiadásából.
A nyomdai munkákat a Robinco Kft. végezte,
felelős vezető Kecskeméthy Péter.

TARTALOMJEGYZÉK



ELŐSZÓ	7
--------------	---

AQUINÓI TAMÁS – RENDSZERES TEOLÓGIAI SZEKCIÓ

MAGYAR BALÁZS DÁVID “What would Calvin say? Responsible Stewardship in the Face of Today’s Ecological and Financial Crisis”	11
NEMEHEGYI-HORVÁT GYÖRGY: A Proposed Methodology for Theological Examination of Controversial Religious Movements Tested on the ‘Convulsionnaires of Saint-Médard’ Phénomena	28

AUGUSTINUS – PATRISZTIKA, ANTIKVITÁS SZEKCIÓ

VRÁBEL TÜNDE: A jók királynője, avagy értekezés a legfőbb jóról.	41
---	----

BOLYKI JÁNOS – BALLAGI MÓR – Ó- ÉS ÚJSZÖVETSÉG, HEBRAISZTIKA SZEKCIÓ

JIANFENG LI: The Redactional Manifestations in Gen. 6:1-4 and Its Relation to the Flood Narrative	59
KOLLÁNYI IRÉN: Jitró és a Midjan	78
KOVÁCS ENIKÓ HAJNALKA: Egyéni panaszének vizsgálata különös tekintettel az 54. Zsoltárra	89
POGÁNY KRISZTINA: Krisztológiai méltóság címek a Zsidókhoz írt levél 1-4. fejezetében	94

COMENIUS – PEDAGÓGIA SZEKCIÓ

BERKI VIKTÓRIA: A hitoktató lehetőségei a fogyasztékosággal élő gyermekek szüleinek kísérésében	107
---	-----

ERDŐSI-BODA KATINKA: Hit, hitrege – A mítosz kérdésköre az etika oktatásában – művészetpedagógiai megközelítéssel –Wagner <i>Lohengrin</i> c. operájának nyomán	125
KISS GABRIELLA: Egy társadalmi kihívás – két pedagógiai válasz – három alapkérdés – Alapkövek Joseph Wresinski és Paolo Freire pedagógiájának megértéséhez	133
PFUSCHER EMESE: A burok, mint egyetemes értékek hordozója: a film és a könyv	143

IPOLYI ARNOLD – EGYHÁZTÖRTÉNETI SZEKCIÓ

FEKETE GÁBOR: Az egyházak szerepe Kárpátalja elemi oktatásrendszerében 1921-ben	149
NEMES ISTVÁN: „...libertinismi in populo principia nulla...”	173
SZABÓ ÁGNES: A Kárpátaljai Református Egyházkerület megalakulása és fejlődése, statisztikai adatok és kérdőíves felmérések tükrében.	183
SZÉKELY GÁBOR: Devóció és disputa, egyháztörténet és felekezeti viszony Telek József kecskeméti prédikációiban.	192
TÁLAS NÁNDOR: Cumans and Islam	206
TÚRI LÁSZLÓ: Emlékműállítás és megemlékezés a szovjet birodalom alkonyán. Polgárjogi és egyházi küzdelem a kárpátaljai magyar közösség életében (1989-1991)	220

SZENCZI MOLNÁR ALBERT – MŰVÉSZET- MŰVELŐDÉSTÖRTÉNETI SZEKCIÓ

FEJES JÁNOS: A keresztes hadjáratok recepciója az európai heavy és extrém metal szövegvilágában – Hét példa	237
NAGY FRUZZINA: To Err is Human	245
POKORNI ANNA ALÍZ: A szabadság fogalma Bergyajev vallásfilozófiájában	256

SZTEHLO GÁBOR – GYAKORLATI TEOLÓGIAI SZEKCIÓ

GYŐRI GÁBOR DÁVID: Templom és iskola – Gyülekezet és intézmény kapcsolatának metaforái	273
DR. MIKES LILI: A terhességmegszakítás normatív rendszerek szerinti megítélése	283
DR. NÉGYESI ZSOLT: Életvégi helyzetek etikai kérdései teológiai összefüggésben, különös tekintettel a gyermekeutanázia legalizálására	300
PŐCZE ISTVÁN: Vallás és lelki egészség	316
SALLAI JAKAB: Vegyes nemzetiségű és felekezeti családok lelkigondozása az erdélyi magyar történelmi egyházakban.	332
ZSIGMOND EDINA: Ortodox zsidó vallási irányzatok válasza a modern politikai cionizmus megjelenésére.	341

ELŐSZÓ



Tisztelt Olvasó!

A Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége Hittudományi Osztálya a következő jelmondatot választotta magának: „Hitetek mellé tudományt”. A Péter Apostol leveléből vett idézet jól fejezi ki azt a célt, amely az Osztály létrejöttét is indokolta, s meghatározza annak munkásságát. Egyik legnagyobb – az osztály által szervezett esemény – a Fiatal Kutatók és Doktoranduszok Nemzetközi Teológus Konferenciája, melyen esszenciálisan is megjelenik ennek a jelmondatnak minden eleme. Az interdiszciplináris tanácskozáson nem csak a szorosan vett hittudomány területéről érkeznek kutatók és doktoranduszok, hanem olyan területekről is, melyek témájukban kapcsolódnak a teológiához.

Ebben a kötetben a Fiatal Kutatók és Doktoranduszok V. Nemzetközi Teológus Konferenciájának publikálásra érdemesnek ítélt tanulmányait tárjuk a közönség elé. Az öt esztendeje minden évenként lebonyolított konferencia komoly hagyománnyal bír, s az egyik legnagyobb a maga nemében. A tanácskozásról elmondahtó, hogy a Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetségének egyetlen olyan rendezvénye, mely sorozatban ilyen sokszor megrendezésre került, a szervezet központi eseményein kívül.

A 2014-es esztendő újdonsága volt, hogy az Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Doktorandusz Önkormányzata is bekapcsolódott a szervezésbe. A másik óriási eredmény, hogy a rendezvény híre átlépte a Kárpát-medencét, s immár Lővenből is érkeztek előadók, s velük együtt nyolc szekcióban több mint félszáz előadó vett részt az eseményen, melyet a Nemzeti Kulturális Alap támogatásával tudtunk lebonyolítani.

Engedjék meg, hogy itt is kifejezzem köszönetemet annak a kilenc szekcióelnöknek, akik szabad idejüket is ránk szánták, s megtisztelték konferenciánkat azzal, hogy levezették az egyes tagozatok üléseit. Amellett, hogy számos, szakmailag előremutató és a későbbi kutatások irányát meghatározó tanáccsal látták

el a fiatal kutatókat, ők voltak azok, akik elbírálták, hogy kinek a tanulmánya érdemes a kötetben történő publikációra. Jelenlétük és személyük tehát nem csak a tanácskozás, de a kötet szakmai garanciáját is jelenti. Ugyancsak hálával tartozunk a Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Hittudományi Karának, mely immár ötödször is befogadta a rendezvényt. Köszönettel tartozunk továbbá a Károli Könyvek szerkesztő bizottságának, hogy kötetünket befogadták sorozatukba.

Az alábbi kötetet ajánlom a tisztelt olvasó figyelmébe, melyek – reményünk szerint – egyházaink és gyülekezeteink hasznát is szolgálják.

Zila Gábor – elnök DOSZ HiTO, KRE DOK, a konferencia főszervezője

NAGY FRUZZSINA
Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Összehasonlító Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola

TO ERR IS HUMAN.

*“And since interpretation is nothing
but the possibility of error,
by claiming that certain degree of blindness
is part of the specificity
of all literature we also reaffirm the absolute
dependence of interpretation on the text and of the text.”*
(Paul de Man)

The aim of this study is to have a close look at the question of border and borderlessness in the poetics of space. I'm going to approach these two interlocked philosophical or literary, fine art categories through the central axis of the notion of error. When we approach these two extreme categories of space we refer to *written* and *visual* representations between which we never draw a sharp borderline because they are always closely connected to each other.

In a European context the connection and disconnection of the notions of border and borderlessness dates back to ancient times. Plato, for instance, says that everything that exists, consists of one and many and “they also innately have within themselves limit, and indeterminacy.” Nature is a harmony of *peras* (boundary) and *apeiron* (boundless). Aristotle, however, defines these two notions by contrasting them in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and he points out that we can find fault in anything in many ways: bad belongs to the borderlessness, while good belongs to the finite things.

“Consider, too, that it is possible to go wrong in more ways than one. In Pythagorean terminology evil is a form of the Unlimited, good of the Limited. As the poet says, *Goodness is one, evil is multiform.*”

“Limits, borders, distances – error, after all, is a quantitative question. And of course it is an ethical problem too, as opposed to the ancient dualism of

moderateness and immoderateness. And although paralleling faulty with border and faultlessness with boundlessness gained an important role in ethical argumentation. Exploring all this, however, would exceed the frames of this study. So putting the ethical dimension apart, which primarily searches for the limits of error, we proceed only in the direction of space poetics that deals with the *errors of border*.

I would like to cast a glance to the word *error*, which we understand as something that is not correct: a *wrong action* or *statement*. If, however, we look back upon the origin of the word we can trace it back to a verb of motion, a Sanskrit form (*ārṣati*), but we can't discover any moral or ethical contents in it. This verb also means '*flowing to and fro, an uncontrolled flowing*'. By keeping this level of meaning in the Proto-Indo-European language they started to use it as '*to roam and wander*' and the Latin verb *erro, errare, erravi, erratum* originally meant *going astray*, too. In the beginning it used to mean straying, adventures, wandering, coming and going, and it had no negative connotation whatsoever. This movement in space, this uncontrolled travelling, this deviation from one's path when related to a person, a person's opinion, began to assume the meaning of '*a departure from the right principle*'. From then on the word assumed the meaning of departing from the truth, then '*a mistake, a delusion, a moral lapse or sin*.' Quintilian already mentioned it as a solecism while Vergil used it to refer not only to the cause but the effect. With him the word 'error' also meant deception, and this illusion was the wooden horse, the structure, which deceived the eyes of the Trojans. While in Latin these meanings existed simultaneously, by the 19th century the word error preserved only the meaning of mistake that today we tend to know primarily from the language of information technology, while the other meanings gradually disappeared through the centuries.

To examine the relation of *border* and *borderlessness* I call to help the above mentioned half-forgotten meanings of the word error, and at first I will speak about *erring*, then about *illusion* and finally about error as *sin* in the Christian sense.

I would like to prove that still there is a strong relation between these three meanings and that the philological corridors between them are connected by the notion of border.

1. ERR IN THE ERROR

In the fifth canto of *Aeneid* Virgil makes mention of a competition ordered by Aeneas's father. However, while describing the tournament, the poet makes a

short digression which itself is about a detour. This story is about a *labyrinth* in Crete, the dwelling place of the Minotaur, built by Daedalus upon the order of King Minos. The labyrinth of the Minotaur is an underground prison, placed in the basement of Knossos Palace by its builder.

Virgil describes the labyrinth with the synonym of *inremeabilis error* so he calls the building an *irretraceable error*.⁵⁵⁹ The logic behind this association of ideas is relatively simple. The labyrinth is an objective space, which had been built of constructed limits, it is based on complex calculation, and it is like an infinite network. Any point of it can relate to any other, however, it has no endpoint. From the outside, it looks like an objective, limited space with a planned structure. On entering, however, the place converts into a subjective space, an instable structure in which the person moving in it begins to stray and inside that *inremeabilis error* bad choices can complicate the problem till obsession. Finally, it can even happen that one has to turn back in it, again and again until infinity, due to which, space becomes borderless for the senses. The duality of the inside and the outside changes in the labyrinth. While from the outside it looks like limited space, from inside it appears to be a broad space for the senses. This is what Virgil refers to with his visual metaphor within the labyrinth: *blind walls* (*parietibus textum caecis*). This trope reinforces the fact that the walls of the maze had not been equipped with signs, there is nothing the victim can conceive as instruction within the structure and this text is enhanced by the forthcoming lines: *signa sequendi frangeret... error*.

“The phrase *signa sequendi frangeret* is very difficult; presumably *signa* means the marks or indications by which one could follow the track on the way back; the nature of the maze breaks the trail.”⁵⁶⁰

Interpreting it as a metonymy, “blind walls” (*parietibus textum caecis*) can refer to something else, to the limits of the body, to the fact that the entering human being is a deprived one – if not the most important – of the five senses, which deprivation he feels most intensively when he roams in the dark room.⁵⁶¹ The ‘mistake of the eye’, the blindness, entails the complete absence of the coordination capacities, since memory works by the creation of a visual field with the help of mental pictures attached to the elements of space. The entrance

⁵⁵⁹ Virgil: Aeneid, V. 588-591. Translator: A. S. Kline, Poetry in Translation, 2002. Accessed December, 15, 2014, http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/VirgilAeneidV.htm#anchor_Toc1537956

⁵⁶⁰ Virgil: Aeneid V, Edited with a Commentary by R.D. Williams, Oxford University Press, 1960. 154.

⁵⁶¹ The Latin expression *caecus* can mean bodily blindness but also darkness at the same time.

of a mortal into the labyrinth suggests that he will suffer an irreversible process, from which there is no way out.

If, however, we continue reading the description of the myth, it becomes clear that the most famous labyrinth of world literature gained its fame by its operation being not exactly faultless. Different literary sources certainly know at least *one person who escaped* from Daedalus's cunning construction.

So to the ground *Theseus* his fallen foeman abasing,
Slew, that his horned toss'd vainly, a sport to the breezes.
Thence in safety, a victor, in height of glory returned,
Guiding *errant* feet to a thred's impalpable order.
Lest, upon egress bent thro' tortuous aisles labyrinthine,
Walls of blindness, a maze unravell'd ever, elude him.⁵⁶²

This man is Theseus, who – through Adriadne's pleading – was assisted by the constructor himself to escape from the grips of death. Daedalus's labyrinth is like an enigma, from which he alone knows the only way out and his objective is to obstruct, mislead and drive the victim straying in out of his course. Daedalus's clew as a line will serve only as a resort for Theseus in the fight to get out. Passing through the hiatus in the line demarcating the border of the labyrinth, this thread is able to crush the concept of the labyrinth in its function. The thread that consists of an infinite number of folds is – in reality – a network of linear lines, and its structure resembles the principles of the construction of labyrinth heaping up curves without an end.

"The world is the infinite curve that touches at an infinity of points an infinity of curves, the curve with a unique variable, the convergent series of all series. A labyrinth is [...] multiple because it contains many folds. The multiple is not only what has many parts but also what is folded in many ways. A labyrinth corresponds to each level: the continuous labyrinth in matter and its parts.⁵⁶³ [...] Thus a continuous labyrinth is not a line dissolving into independent points, as flowing sand might dissolve into grains, but resembles a sheet of paper divided into infinite folds or separated into bending movements, each one determined

⁵⁶² Robinson Ellis (translator): The poems and fragments of Catullus, LXIV. 111-115, John Murray, Albemarle Street, London, 1871. 58.

"[...] sic domito saevum prostravit corpore Theseus/ nequiquam vanis iactantem cornua ventis./ inde pedem sospes multa cum laude reflexit/ errabunda regens tenui vestigia filo,/ ne labyrinthis e flexibus egredientem/ tecti frustraretur inobservabilis error."

⁵⁶³ Gilles Deleuze: The fold: Leibniz and the Baroque, trans. Tom Conley, The Athlone Press, London, 1993. 3. (Later as: Deleuze)

by consistent or conspiring surroundings. [...]The unit of matter, the smallest element of the labyrinth, is the *fold*, not the point which is never a part, but a simple extremity of the line.”⁵⁶⁴

The aesthetics of the labyrinth finds existence in overgrowth and in the art of endless winding which endlessly produces folds, especially at the time of the baroque, where the two dimensional image of the labyrinth was geared into three dimensions which were the mazes of the French gardens.⁵⁶⁵ Here also, through the description of the content, it strives to shock the spectator, what it reaches by its baroque overgrowth. This phenomenon of infinite folding and overgrowth crops up in painting, sculpture and architecture, too.

It can be recognized in the textile model of the kind implied by garments, the baroque costume, or in sculpture where marble seizes and bears to infinity folds that cannot be explained by the body. In painting, the still life's usual formula is the drapery, producing folds of air or heavy clothes. By this overgrowth the matter tended to flow out of the frame, and thus the frame disappeared totally.⁵⁶⁶

This paintings' main purpose was to offer strange and deceptive views with an illusionistic game. By its misleading technique, continuously pointing out the viewers' limits of sensation and by removing its own frames it goes beyond the methods of artistic tradition, and just like in the case of the labyrinth, comes upon its own border and borderlessness.

2. ERROR AS ILLUSION

In the artistic current dedicated to the grand qualities of spatial deception, “physical space becomes entirely pictorial, and those who find themselves within it are direct participants in the portrayed events.”⁵⁶⁷ The phenomenon called *trompe l'oeil* in arts is based on cheating the eye in good faith, and its purpose is to mislead the viewer, to make him see non-existing spaces and objects as real. Trompe l'oeil which comes from the French word *tromper* means deceiving and making a mistake (to be mistaken) at the same time.

⁵⁶⁴ Deleuze 6.

⁵⁶⁵ And though we can replace the word – labyrinth – itself, by the denomination of gardens made up of live hedges, the moment of misleading cannot be eliminated, even from this definition. Because the word ‘hedge’ in English language itself has two meanings: first, it refers to formation of the plant, which we all know very well, on the other hand, it also means: ‘beating about the bush’, when somebody evades giving a straight answer.

⁵⁶⁶ Deleuze 121-123.

⁵⁶⁷ Flamino Gualdoni: *Trompe L'oeil*, Skira, Milano, 2008. 16.

Among of the “origin myths” of trompe l’oeil the most famous is Pliny’s, who, in his *Naturalis Historia* emphasises the shocking effect of the paintings on their viewers. Parrhasius, he said, entered into a pictorial contest with Zeuxis, who represented some grapes painted so naturally, that the birds flew towards the spot where the picture was exhibited. Parrhasius, on the other hand, exhibited a curtain, drawn with such singular truthfulness, that Zeuxis, elated with judgment, which had been passed upon his work by the birds, haughtily demanded, that the curtain should be drawn aside, to let the picture be seen.⁵⁶⁸ Upon finding his mistake, with a great degree of ingenuous candour he admitted, that he had been surpassed; for while he himself had only deceived the birds, Parrhasius had deceived him, an artist.

As we can read in the story, at first trompe l’oeil painting took on picturing abstract objects. That is depicting all the things which could seem as unnecessary efforts in a work of art. It realistically depicts everyday items of which we do not even assume to be part of a piece of art.

In a book on paintings, Vasari relates the following story about Giotto the famous painter. Cimabue, Giotto’s master, who discovers the young painter realizes quite early what unprecedented disciple he had come across. So he takes the young boy to his studio and continuously keeps an eye on him. One day Cimabue goes into his studio to check the work of his disciple and he is pleased to see that the colours are exactly the same as if he had painted them himself. Then he unexpectedly notices that a fly is on the nose of a face in the painting. Cimabue waves his hand in relief to whisk it away but the fly wouldn’t fly away. So he takes a closer look at the fly; and then at that moment Cimabue realized that the fly was painted and not real.⁵⁶⁹

The cult of painted flies has gone a long way in painting, and Vasari calls the mentioned Giotto its father. Because it seems real the viewer wants to whisk it away, therefore the lifelike representation of the insect became the proof of the artistic skill of the painter. Vasari’s *ekphrasis* illustrates how the painting can step over its own shadow by Giotto placing a mistake on it, and it works even if

⁵⁶⁸ Pliny the Elder: *The Natural History*, eds., John Bostock, Henry T Riley, Karl Friedrich Theodor Mayhoff, Perseus Digital Library, 2006. Accessed November, 18, 2014, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:abo:phi.0978,001:35:36>

One of the most extreme adaptations of the antique story is Gijsbrecht’s canvas which depicts its own reverse side – similarly to Zeuxis – prompts of the viewer of the picture to turn it and see what description the other side shows. Cornelius Gijsbrecht: *The reverse side of a painting* (c. 1670), Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen

⁵⁶⁹ Giorgio Vasari: *Stories of the Italian Artists*, translator: E. L. Seeley, Duffield & Co., New York, 1908. 12.

the picture is enclosed in a frame.⁵⁷⁰ At the same time Vasari is at a loss when the enchantment is gone and we realize that the fly is not real. This takes us closer to the limits of the representation capabilities of painting and to the end of story, too.

Except we asked the question how we can deal with the fact that the genre of painted flies became popular only in the middle of the 15th century, exactly at a time when Vasari lived and not Giotto. Again, we are the witnesses of a *dual deception*, so to say, like in the case of the labyrinth. But here it is Vasari who cheats his readers because his story about Giotto is false; *Giotto had never painted a fly*. But Vasari's anecdote on Giotto is often a reference point in the appraisal of the flies of the trompe l'oeil pictures.

So we must emphasize another important point of view in this story that is not praised by the discourse. And this is the fact that Vasari – while describing this high standard presentation of trompe l'oeil – achieved the representation of the same genre in another art, handing it to the recipients as a literary text. Thus *textuality* continues the action where the “picture” has already been closed, so we can have a glimpse on the other, literary side of the self-covered trompe l'oeil. Here it (the fly, as the symbol of Error) is not written into the memory on the level of motif, but on the much primary level of meta-language. So the real fraud cannot be found in the realistic painting of the fly, but primarily in the momentum when we believe that we are talking about an ekphrasis and not about an illustration in connection with the trompe l'oeil flies.

3. ERROR IN-ERRANCY⁵⁷¹

While the discourse mentioned above emphasizes the flawlessness of the illusion, the joy of knowing the mimesis and the tricking of the receptive, the

⁵⁷⁰ When creating a trompe l'oeil painting frames were not applied in order to achieve a more lifelike result. “In theory, the trompe l'oeil should not be framed, because the frame betrays as a painting, whereas it should be mistaken for the subject it represents.” Henry Cadiou : *Trompe-L'oeil*, préf. d'André Guégan; trad. anglaise par Elizabeth S. Dutertre, Int. Distr. Fischbacher, Paris, 1983. 27.

⁵⁷¹ “Errancy is the free space for that turning in which insistent ek-sistence adroitly forgets and mistakes itself constantly anew. The concealing of the concealed being as a whole holds sway in that disclosure of specific beings, which, as forgottenness of concealment, becomes errancy. [...] Errancy is the open site for and ground of error. Error is not just an isolated mistake but rather the realm (the domain) of the history of those entanglements in which all kinds of erring get interwoven.” Martin Heidegger: *On the Essence of Truth*. translated by John Sallis, in *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell, Harper & Row, New York, 1977. Accessed November 17, 2014. <http://aphelis.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Martin-Heidegger-On-the-Essence-of-Truth.pdf>

following part takes on interpreting a picture that becomes a *trompe l'oeil* picture by depicting the flaw, and will present the object of the error from another perspective.

One of the masterpieces of *trompe l'oeil* is Giovanni Santi's picture *Christ supported by two angels*.⁵⁷² This painting is one of the *Andachtsbilder* pictures whose original function is to represent *Christ in Pain*. The identification with the sufferings of the Saviour can lead believers not to pass-by others' suffering unaffected, or to bear their own bodily and psychic tribulations more easily.

The curiosity of Christ in Pain in Santi's picture also lies in the representation of the fly.⁵⁷³ Compared to Jesus' body it is too large but it exactly corresponds to real life. By distorting its proportions he aims at deceiving our visual senses, primarily – what Vasari emphasises in connection with Giotto's non-existing fly – to make us believe that it is real. Santi, however, in an essential point renews the classical *trompe l'oeil* mechanism by focusing on the relations between “the fly and the illusion-vision”. He also counts on the cultural tradition-centred thinking of the viewer, not only on his senses, but on the attitude with which the viewer starts watching a religious picture. Santi counts on the spectators' comprehension, in which it is not usual that the insect should form a part of the *imago pietatis*.⁵⁷⁴

The reason we don't immediately realize that it is a trap, is the unusual character of the picture and as a logical step we would even approach the painting to whisk the fly away to protect the holy picture. In order to delay the symbolic meaning of the picture none of the three characters depicted on the picture look in the direction of the insect. They don't care for it despite the fact that it is placed near to Christ's wound.⁵⁷⁵ This way the fly is, first of all, a subject

⁵⁷² Giovanni Santi: *Christ supported by two angels* alias *Misericordia Domini*, (c.1490), oil on canvas, 66,5 x 54,5 cm, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest

⁵⁷³ The fly also functioned as a signature of the best painters by which they show their talent to their contemporaries. Signature plays a very important part in the notion of border(lessness). The signature, as *autoprésentation*, isolates the picture from all other representation, by belonging to an individual, thus the painting is determined by its owner. It also functions in the absence of its creator regardless of his spatial and temporary position. (See more about the problematics of signature in Derrida's book: *From Spectres of Marx*.)

⁵⁷⁴ Even so, the fly's appearance in religious representation is not unprecedented. What is really unique in Santi's picture is that the fly appears in another context, in the moment of crisis, in the process of dying, in the moment before the secret ritual of Resurrection. He does not portray the fly beside the Child Jesus (Carlo Crivelli, *Madonna and Child*) or painted on a skull after death, (Guercino, *Et in Arcadia Ego*), but he painted it on the body of the suffering exposed Christ.

⁵⁷⁵ Ambiguous references form a basic element of Christ's speech. These references, parables we can consider dramatically well-accomplished text elements in the Gospels, where the cause

to being mistaken, the subject of *mistake*.⁵⁷⁶ It's a deficient viewpoint, which is based on expectations and presuppositions.

"[...] error is first of all a belief, or rather, an *opinion*: consisting in acquiescing, in saying yes, in *opining* too early, this fault of *judgement* and not of perception betrays the excess of infinite will over finite understanding. I am in error, I deceive *myself*, because, being able to exercise my will infinitely and in an instant, I can will to move myself beyond perception, can will [*vouloir*] beyond sight [*voir*]."⁵⁷⁷

In the course of critical consideration the fly becomes the picture's 'fly in the ointment', the flaw, which undermines the painting's original function to take us to another world, that is from the secular to the holy world. The insect behaves in this space as an alien character and becomes the protagonist of the representation where conventions would not allow a space to it.⁵⁷⁸ So, on the one hand, the viewer feels uncomfortable because this creature's appearance cleaves asunder the interpretation of the Christ-representation and on the other hand he tries to understand the function of the *Other* in the picture. Despite the fact that this other is only a *detail* (or *détail*) of the picture, its aim is still to provoke us with its irregularity and unusual existence, it makes us doubt the rightfulness of its appearance in the painting.

"Nor there is any sort of aesthetic self-contained part of the body that could so easily be aesthetically ruined as a whole by the disfigurement of a single part. That just means that the unity is originated in and ascending from diversity – no part of it can be touched by the twist of fate without having all the other parts changed – as if it would be held together by a single root."⁵⁷⁹

leading to a misunderstanding can be found in the literal or symbolical interpretation of a given metaphor. John Painter: *John: Witness and Theologian*, SPCK, London, 1979. 82.

⁵⁷⁶ It is the fly that actually points at the common limit of the picture and mankind as well. In a religious picture it points to the first error of mankind, the original sin.

⁵⁷⁷ Jacques Derrida: *Memoirs of the Blind: the self-portrait and other ruins*, translator: Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1993. 13.

⁵⁷⁸ It was a common habit to paint the unclean insect as an alienating gesture, into places where their presence was not welcome." The painted fly is serving as a protective talisman against the real insects which otherwise might settle and leave their dirt marks on the brushwork of a sacred theme. It was a common practice to display images of undesirable insects in buildings in order to keep them away." James Hall: *Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art*, John Murray, London, 1974. 126.

⁵⁷⁹ Georg Simmel: *Die ästhetische Bedeutung des Gesichts*, Der Lotse. In: *Hamburgische Wochenschrift für deutsche Kultur*. 1. Jg. 2. Band, (Heft 35 vom 1. Juni 1901)

"Auch gibt es keinen irgendwie ästhetisch in sich geschlossenen Teil des Körpers, der durch eine Verunstaltung einer einzelnen Stelle so leicht als Ganzes ästhetisch ruiniert werden könnte. Das eben bedeutet doch die Einheit aus und über dem Vielen, dass keinen Teil dieses ein Schicksal

Thus the fly has to be considered a separable, standalone part as well as a non-separable part, since the score of the whole does not work without it. It gets an emphasized place as a foreign body and participates in the narrative of the picture. The fly, as a part of the picture, illuminates the other details of the picture. It draws *attention to the artistry of the representation*. The reality of the insect truly is not only an illusion, but more of the incarnation of illusionlessness. Its real size and ruthless reality implies the future disintegration of the body – the momentum that is going to happen to you at a certain point, the moment of death. It works on the picture as a digression in the body of the text, and though for a moment – as *trompe l'oeil* – it interrupts the main storyline, also re-interprets it with its attention-calling role, bringing us closer to the main plot of the painting: the suffering of Jesus.⁵⁸⁰

“But what about the fly painted on the chest of the suffering Christ by Giovanni Santi, father of Raffaello? It's not only about the craftsmanship of the painter. The exclusively artistic determination of the eyes could hardly be connected to the religious function of the picture, which is highlighted by clarifying the wounds of Christ, because Raffaello's father is not considered an ironic rebel/iconoclast.⁵⁸¹ [...] It is also possible that this irregular presence has a startling effect after all; it helps the viewers to actualize their religious connection to the picture (e.g.: in Giovanni Santi, the inefaceable taint of the body of Christ makes the viewers to remember the scandal connected to the wounds of the same body, and caused by mankind).”⁵⁸²

Arasse interprets these man-caused wounds on the body of the Christ as points of collective memory. Suggesting another approach, which is closely

treffen kann, das nicht, wie durch die zusammenhaltende Wurzel des Ganzen hindurch, auch jeden anderen Teil träfe.” Accessed November 19, 2014. <http://socio.ch/sim/verschiedenes/1901/gesicht.htm>

⁵⁸⁰ Digression has a similar path to error. Its space poetical meaning (wandering from the main path of a journey) changes into a linguistic-literary category via the expansion of meaning.

⁵⁸¹ Daniel Arasse: *Le détail: pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture*, Flammarion, Paris, 1996. 119.

“Mais qu'en est-il de cette mouche que Giovanni Santi, le père de Raphaël, peint sur la poitrine du *Christ de Pitié*? Le savoir-faire du peintre n'est ici pas seul en jeu; une détermination exclusivement artistique du regard s'accorderait mal avec la fonction dévote de l'image, clairement soulignée par la mise en évidence des plaies du Christ – et le père de Raphaël n'est pas un iconoclaste ironique.”

⁵⁸² Daniel Arasse: *Le détail: pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture*, 122.

“Elle peut être là aussi pour que cette présence incongrue suscite une surprise efficace et aide celui qui regarde à actualiser le rapport dévot à l'image, rappelant par exemple chez Giovanni Santi, sous forme d'une souillure inefaçable du corps du Christ, le scandale des plaies portées par les hommes sur ce même corps.”

connected to this perspective, I'd like to point out the events of the afternoon prior to the crucifixion of Christ. In the description of the Last Supper in the Gospel of John we can read an expressive description of the moment when Christ predicted that one of his disciples will betray him.

"Then the disciples looked at one another, perplexed about whom He spoke. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore motioned to him to ask who it was of whom He spoke. Then, leaning back on Jesus' breast, he said to Him, „*Lord, who is it?*”⁵⁸³

This beloved disciple, who is John himself by the way, lays on the very place where, a few hours later, the fly, the symbol of death appears. Though Jesus answers John's questions his words fall upon an unheeding ear. Later on in the gospel we can read that each and every disciple had received the mystery of the Eucharist, even the betrayer who was the first among the disciples to take the blood and body of Christ. The fly in the New Testament is not only the symbol of death but the symbol of betrayal and evil as well. In the gospel of Matthew Satan appears as Beelzebub, whose name means the *God of Flies* so in a theological interpretation the fly is the "symbol of Error" in opposition to the Eternal Justice. The fly carries an important, iconic role in its connection with the body, which role bears the gesture of incorporation. This can be recognized in the Eucharist as treason and in its relation with the body after death. Although the fly can consume the body, it can do no harm to the soul. Moreover, it receives something Unknown to it via the incorporation and the touch. Looking from inside (the picture) the fly will be the only actor, who can gain a share of infinity by touching the body of Christ.

To sum up my thoughts, without trying to deceive anybody, I can say that error in certain cases, cannot be only negative but acceptable for us. Not simply acceptable, but it can be productive and positive, and to go further, we cherish a basic desire for it, and it can cause joy. The *Error* is an important organizer element of defining, crossing and deleting borders both in fine arts and in literature. Meaning either to be lost in the web of intertextuality, the imagination of the illusion of perfect reception or the total number of faults during the constitution of *interpretation*, it remains the same from one perspective: it always has the risk of border (lessness).

⁵⁸³ Jn. 13, 22-25. (New King James Version)